



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS
425 Eye Street N.W.
ULLB, 3rd Floor
Washington, D.C. 20536

JUN 13 2000

File: EAC-98-078-52616

Office: Vermont Service Center

Date:

IN RE: Petitioner:
Beneficiary:

Petition: Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: Self-represented

Public Copy

INSTRUCTIONS:


This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,
EXAMINATIONS


Terrence M. O'Reilly, Director
Administrative Appeals Office

Identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

JUN 2000 031203

DISCUSSION: The immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a church. It seeks classification of the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1153(b)(4), to serve as a pastor. The director denied the petition determining that the petitioner had failed to establish the beneficiary's two years of continuous religious work experience.

On appeal, the petitioner reviews the beneficiary's prior work experience.

Section 203(b)(4) of the Act provides classification to qualified special immigrant religious workers as described in section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(C), which pertains to an immigrant who:

- (i) for at least 2 years immediately preceding the time of application for admission, has been a member of a religious denomination having a bona fide nonprofit, religious organization in the United States;

- (ii) seeks to enter the United States--

- (I) solely for the purpose of carrying on the vocation of a minister of that religious denomination,

- (II) before October 1, 2000, in order to work for the organization at the request of the organization in a professional capacity in a religious vocation or occupation, or

- (III) before October 1, 2000, in order to work for the organization (or for a bona fide organization which is affiliated with the religious denomination and is exempt from taxation as an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Code of 1986) at the request of the organization in a religious vocation or occupation; and

- (iii) has been carrying on such vocation, professional work, or other work continuously for at least the 2-year period described in clause (i).

The beneficiary is a thirty-four-year-old single male native and citizen of Colombia. The petitioner indicated that the beneficiary

was not in the United States at the time the petition was filed, and that he was residing in Colombia.

At issue in the director's decision is whether the petitioner has established that the beneficiary had two years of continuous work experience in the proffered position.

8 C.F.R. 204.5(m) (1) states, in pertinent part, that:

All three types of religious workers must have been performing the vocation, professional work, or other work continuously (either abroad or in the United States) for at least the two year period immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

The petition was filed on January 14, 1998. Therefore, the petitioner must establish that the beneficiary had been continuously working in the prospective occupation for at least the two years from January 14, 1996 to January 14, 1998.

In its letter submitted with the petition, the petitioner stated that "from 1992 to 1995 [the beneficiary] named in Medellin Church al[s]o he attending the Church in prison assisting the people spiritual the prison of Buena Vista." The petitioner provided a list of its religious workers. The beneficiary is not named on this list. The petitioner did not provide any information about the beneficiary's work experience during the two-year period prior to filing.

On appeal, the petitioner states that "from 1995 to 1998 [the beneficiary] continuous as assistant pastor in our church." The petitioner has not submitted any evidence, or description, of the beneficiary's purported employment at its church during the two-year period prior to filing. Simply going on record without supporting documentary evidence is not sufficient for purposes of meeting the burden of proof in these proceedings. See Matter of Treasure Craft of California, 14 I&N Dec. 190 (Reg. Comm. 1972). Moreover, the petitioner had indicated that the beneficiary was residing in Colombia at the time the petition was filed and it did not name the beneficiary on its list of religious workers. On appeal, the petitioner is claiming that the beneficiary was working for it from 1995 to 1998. The petitioner has not provided any explanation for this apparent discrepancy. A petitioner may not make material changes to a petition that has already been filed in an effort to make an apparently deficient petition conform to Service requirements. Matter of Izumii, Int. Dec. 3360 (Assoc. Comm., Ex., July 13, 1998).

The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary was continuously engaged in a religious occupation from January 14,

1996 to January 14, 1998. The objection of the director has not been overcome on appeal. Accordingly, the petition may not be approved.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has failed to establish that the prospective occupation is a religious occupation as defined at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(m)(2). Also, the petitioner has failed to establish that it made a valid job offer as required at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(m)(4), or that it has the ability to pay the proffered wage as required at 8 C.F.R. 204.5(g)(2). As the appeal will be dismissed on the ground discussed, these issues need not be examined further.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.